Plaintiff Republican National Committee ("Plaintiff") and Defendant Google LLC, erroneously sued as "Google Inc." ("Defendant") (collectively, the "Parties"), by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate as follows:

- 1. WHEREAS, on January 23, 2023, Defendant moved to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint (Dkt. 30) and filed a supporting request for judicial notice (Dkt. 31);
- 2. WHEREAS, on February 27, 2023, Plaintiff opposed Defendant's motion to dismiss (Dkt. 35) and also filed a motion to strike certain exhibits to Defendant's request for judicial notice (Dkt. 34);
- 3. WHEREAS, Defendant's motion to dismiss and Plaintiff's motion to strike are both set for hearing on April 20, 2023;
- 4. WHEREAS, pursuant to the parties' stipulation and this Court's order,
  Defendant's reply in support of its motion to dismiss is currently due on March 27, 2023
  (Dkts. 32, 33);
- 5. WHEREAS, pursuant to E.D. Cal. Local Rule 230(c), Defendant's opposition to Plaintiff's motion to strike is currently due on March 13, 2023;
- 6. WHEREAS, the parties seek to promote efficiency in the resolution of the motion to dismiss, the request for judicial notice, and the motion to strike, all of which are related;
- 7. WHEREAS, the Parties jointly request permission to extend Defendant's deadline to respond to Plaintiff's motion to strike so that Defendant's opposition is due on March 27, 2023, the same day as its reply in support of its motion to dismiss (Dkt. 33);
- 8. WHEREAS, the only prior extensions that have been sought in this action relate to Defendant's deadline to respond to the complaint and related briefing (Dkts. 13, 32), all of which extension requests were granted by the Court (Dkts. 14, 33); no prior extensions have been sought with respect to Plaintiff's motion to strike;

	Case 2:22-cv-01904-TLN-JDP Document 36 Filed 03/02/23 Page 3 of 6
1	THEREFORE, the Parties respectfully request that the Court extend Defendant's deadline
2	to respond to Plaintiff's motion to strike to March 27, 2023, which is the same date that
3	Defendant's reply in support of its motion to dismiss is due.
4	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
5	Dated: March 2, 2023 PERKINS COIE LLP
6	
7	By: /c/ Sunita Rali
8	B <u>y: /s/ Sunita Bali</u> Sunita Bali, Bar No. 274108
9	Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC
10	(erroneously sued as Google Inc.)
11	Dated: March 2, 2023 DHILLON LAW GROUP INC.
12	Difference of the contract of
13	By: /s/ Thomas R. McCarthy
13	Harmeet K. Dhillon, SBN 207873
	Michael A. Columbo, SBN 271283 Jeremiah D. Graham, SBN 313206
15	Anthony J. Fusaro, Jr., SBN 345017
16	Counsel for Plaintiff Republican National Committee
17	Committee
18	CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC
19	Thomas R. McCarthy (pro hac vice)
20	Thomas S. Vaseliou (pro hac vice)
21	Conor D. Woodfin (pro hac vice)
22	Counsel for Plaintiff Republican National Committee
23	Committee
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	-3-

## Case 2:22-cv-01904-TLN-JDP Document 36 Filed 03/02/23 Page 4 of 6 **ATTESTATION** Concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the individual whose electronic signature is attributed above. By: /s/ Sunita Bali Sunita Bali, Bar No. 274108 Attorneys for Google LLC (erroneously sued as Google Inc.)

## Case 2:22-cv-01904-TLN-JDP Document 36 Filed 03/02/23 Page 5 of 6 [PROPOSED] ORDER The Court, having reviewed the Stipulation To Extend Time To Respond to Motion To Strike, and good cause appearing, HEREBY ORDERS that Defendant's deadline to respond to Plaintiff's motion to strike is extended to March 27, 2023. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: March , 2023 Hon. Troy L. Nunley United States District Judge